

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 06 2005

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 - 13 are presently pending in the application. As it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form, the claims have not been amended to overcome the references.

In item 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1 - 5, 7 - 10, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,477,674 to Bates et al ("BATES").

In item 4 of the Office Action, claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over BATES in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,704,897 to Takagi ("TAKAGI"). In item 5 of the Office Action, claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over BATES in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,751,151 to Levy et al ("LEVY").

Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections.

More particularly, claim 1 recites, among other limitations:

first and second equally sized groups of interface circuits, wherein each interface circuit of said first group is assigned exactly one interface circuit of said second group; [emphasis added by Applicant]

Applic. No. 10/075,656

Response Dated December 6, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 6, 2005

Claim 7 incorporates therein all limitations of claim 1, and thus, likewise, recites the above limitation. As such, all of Applicant's claims require, among other things, a 1:1 correspondence between interface circuits of a first group and interface circuits of a second group (i.e., each interface circuit of the first group being assigned to exactly one interface circuit of the second group).

Applicant's claims 1 and 7 additionally recite, among other limitations:

a respective electrical connection of the interface circuits of said first and second groups to outside of the semiconductor module, for enabling a self-test; [emphasis added by Applicant]

As such, Applicant's claimed invention requires, among other things, electrical connections to the first and second interface circuits, for enabling a self-test.

Applicant believes that the BATES reference fails to teach or suggest: 1) Applicant's particularly claimed 1:1 correspondence between the interface circuits of the first and second groups; and 2) the electrical connections from the interface circuits for self-testing.

Applic. No. 10/075,656

Response Dated December 6, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 6, 2005

More particularly, BATES discloses a method and apparatus for conducting input/output loopback tests using a local pattern generator and delay elements. BATES discloses an integrated circuit including a plurality of I/O buffers, each of which includes an I/O test circuit that generates test pattern signals whenever the integrated circuit is operating in a loopback test mode. See the Abstract of BATES. Pages 2 - 3 of the Office Action state, in part:

The Applicant argues on pages 9 and 10 "However, BATES does not particularly disclose much about these 'other IC 100 devices'. For example, BATES does not particularly disclose whether these 'other IC 100 devices' are arranged in a second group of input/output buffers or if such a 'second group' comprises the same number of input/output buffers as the first group". In response to Applicant's argument the Examiner would like to refer the Applicant back to Figure 5, which is a block diagram of one embodiment of an integrated circuit (IC) 500 that includes input/output (I/O) buffers 100(1)-100(n). I/O buffers 100(1)-100(n) make up a data block of I/O circuitry for transmitting to and receiving data from other IC 100 devices. The "other IC 100 devices" Bates is referring to, as interpreted by the Examiner, is a duplication of IC 500 that includes other groups of input/output (I/O) buffers 100(1)-100(n), which qualifies the "other IC 100 devices" as the second group. Bates continues to teach that a data block includes sixteen (16) I/O buffers 100. However, in other embodiments, a data block may include other multiples (e.g., 2, 4, 8, 12, 18, 32, 40, 64, etc.) of I/O buffers 100. (Col. 4, 11.28 - 37). It stands to reason to one skilled in the art that the I/O buffers 100 (i.e. as well as other IC 100 devices) are groups that are duplicated and therefore, comprises the same number of input/output buffers as the first group. In light of the arguments presented above, the Examiner's only conclusion is that Bates substantially teaches "first and second equally sized groups of interface circuits, wherein each interface circuit of said first group is

Applic. No. 10/075,656

Response Dated December 6, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 6, 2005

assigned exactly one interface circuit of said second group;" and "a first circuit connected to said first group and serving to generate test signals to be multiplexed in and output via said interface circuits of said first group; a second circuit connected to said second group for receiving and processing test signals received via said interface circuits of said second group;" [emphasis added by Applicant]

Applicant respectfully traverses the above statement from the Office Action.

BATES does not explicitly state or show that "other IC 100 devices" are I/O devices in equal number to and/or correspond in a 1:1 relationship with the I/O devices 100(1) - 100(n) shown in Fig. 5. This is supported by the above quoted section of the Office Action. Further, in countering Applicant's arguments to this effect, the Office Action uses such phrases as "as interpreted by the Examiner", "It stands to reason to one skilled in the art that", and "the Examiner's only conclusion", which implies that the standard being used to apply BATES to Applicant's claims is one of obviousness. However, Applicant notes that Applicant's independent claims 1 and 7, including the above limitations, as well as other claims, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), which section regards alleged anticipation by a reference. As stated in MPEP § 706.02:

IV. DISTINCTION BETWEEN 35 U.S.C. 102 AND 103

Applic. No. 10/075,656

Response Dated December 6, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 6, 2005

The distinction between rejections based on 35 U.S.C. 102 and those based on 35 U.S.C. 103 should be kept in mind. Under the former, the claim is anticipated by the reference. No question of obviousness is present. In other words, for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. Whereas, in a rejection based on 35 U.S.C. 103, the reference teachings must somehow be modified in order to meet the claims. The modification must be one which would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. See MPEP § 2131 - § 2146 for guidance on patentability determinations under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103. [emphasis added by Applicant]

As such, if, indeed, a standard of obviousness is being applied against Applicant's claims, it is respectfully requested that the present rejection be withdrawn, and a new rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), be issued in its place.

Further, as stated above, Applicant maintains its belief that the BATES reference fails to teach or suggest, among other limitations of Applicant's claims, the particularly claimed 1:1 correspondence between the interface circuits of the first and second groups. Page 5 of the Office Action again points to col. 4 of BATES, lines 28 - 36, as allegedly disclosing Applicant's particularly claimed first and second equally sized groups of interface circuits. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Col. 4 of BATES, lines 28 - 36, states:

FIG. 5 is a block diagram of one embodiment of an integrated circuit (IC) 500. IC 500 includes

Applic. No. .0/075,656

Response Dated December 6, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 6, 2005

input/output (I/O) buffers 100(1)-100(n). I/O buffers 100(1)-100(n) make up a data block of I/O circuitry for transmitting to and receiving data from other IC 100 devices.

Col. 4, lines 32 - 36 of BATES identifies the number of buffers illustrated in Figure 5.

However, Applicant maintains that Fig. 5 of BATES only discloses one single plurality of buffers 100(1) - 100(n). More particularly, Applicant maintains that BATES fails to teach or suggest that each of the buffers 100(1) - 100(n) of Fig. 5 of BATES is assigned to one respective corresponding interface circuit or buffer of a second, equally sized group of interface circuits.

Col. 4 of BATES, lines 50 - 52 merely discloses that, in general, input/output buffers 100 maybe connected to one another. However, this disclosure in BATES refers to normal operation mode but not to test mode. Furthermore, in BATES' normal mode of operation, input/output buffers of the integrated circuit usually are connected to input/output buffers of another integrated circuit, but not to further input/output buffers of the same integrated circuit. In normal operation of a device, when plural integrated circuits are provided and connected to one another within a larger electronic component, input/output buffers of a first

Applic. No. 10/075,656

Response Dated December 6, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 6, 2005

integrated circuit will not be connected to further input/output buffers of the same integrated circuit chip but only to input/output buffers of the second (perhaps identical) integrated circuit chip. Otherwise, the input/output buffers would not to be called "input/output" buffers, because, in normal operation mode, any "input/output" buffers are forwarding signals either leaving or arriving at the chip.

Further, the Examiner's "conclusion", made in the Office Action, is contradictory to the technical teachings of BATES. Fig. 1 of BATES illustrates one single buffer 100, including a test circuit 110 for test pattern generation, an output driver (comprising elements 115, 120, 125 and 130) and an input receiver (comprising elements 145 and 150). In BATES' normal operation mode, signals may be forwarded from the core (See Fig. 1 of BATES, upper left corner) via the output driver and the input/output pad 135 to another chip. Alternatively, signals arriving at the chip, via pad 135 of Fig. 1 of BATES, may be sent via the input receiver to the core (See Fig. 1 of BATES, bottom left corner).

According to BATES, the input/output buffers 100 each include a test circuit 110 for performing a self-test of the respective input/output buffer. This test is referred to as the "I/O loopback test" in BATES, col. 1, line 33, col. 2,

Applic. No. 10/075,656
Response Dated December 6, 2005
Responsive to Office Action of September 6, 2005

line 47, column 3, lines 34 and 48 and column 6, line 25. In BATES', a respective buffer 100 is tested during the I/O loopback self-test to determine whether the respective buffer is defective. As such, the loopback self-test of BATES performs a test within, and only within, the respective buffer electrical path including elements 115, 120, 125, 130, 145, 150, 110 to test if the respective buffer is operating properly. In particular, in the test mode of BATES no test signals are leaving the respective buffer 100 under test, via the input/output pad 135 (Fig. 1 of BATES) since only the internal electronic components of the respective buffer 100 are tested.

Fig. 2 of BATES illustrates a detailed view of the I/O test circuit 110 which serves to generate the test pattern signals. BATES' test circuit 110 includes a test pattern generator 210, an output line connected to MUX 115 of the buffer 100 (compare Figs. 1 and 2 of BATES) and an input line for receiving input signals incoming from amplifier 145 (compare Figs. 1 and 2 of BATES; and col. 3, lines 62 - 64 of BATES). Further, the test circuit 110 illustrated in Fig. 2 OF BATES (and provided in each input/output buffer 100, as illustrated in Fig. 1 of BATES) includes a stage 215. Col. 3 of BATES, lines 60 - 64, states:

According to one embodiment, stage unit 215 provides a

Applic. No. 10/075,656

Response Dated December 6, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 6, 2005

one cycle delay for the test pattern signals before they are transmitted to compare unit 220 be compared with test signals received from amp 145.

As such, the stage unit 215 of BATES serves to directly connect the generated test pattern signal to the compare unit 220. See BATES, Fig. 2. By this way, in BATES, a duplicated test pattern signal is provided for comparison with the signal received from amplifier 145. See BATES, col. 5, lines 65 - 67.

In reviewing Fig. 1 and 2 of BATES in context with one another, it becomes apparent that each buffer 100 includes a test circuit 110 generating a test signal, which, in the form of a first duplicate signal, is passed across elements 115, 120, 125, 130, 145, 150 within the respective buffer 100, before again arriving in the test circuit 110 for comparison in the compare unit 220. The second duplicate signal is sent directly within the test circuit 110 to the stage 215 and from the stage 215 to the compare unit 220. Note that each buffer 100 shown in Figs. 1 and 5 of BATES, must include its own, respective test circuit 110, which only serves to test the respective individual buffer 100.

When this self-test of the respective buffer is performed in BATES, no electrical connection to any other second corresponding input/output buffer 100 is made, at all. In

Applic. No. 10/075,656
Response Dated December 6, 2005
Responsive to Office Action of September 6, 2005

particular, during the self-test mode for a particular buffer in BATES, no test signal is leaving the respective buffer 100 via the input/output pad 135 or being sent to an input/output pad 135 of a second respective input/output buffer.

In BATES, plural buffers may be connected to one another, but only in normal operation mode and only to buffers of another chip. In the test mode of BATES, however, the closed loop for the test pattern signal extends only within the respective buffer 100, starting from the test circuit 110, and arriving back at the same test circuit 110.

Col. 7 of BATES, lines 1 - 3 explicitly discloses:

A particular I/O buffer 100(x) will be considered to have failed the test if the expected test data is not received at latch 230.

As such, the loopback self-test of BATES does not involve communication with any second buffer of any second group.

In particular, in BATES, when the self-tests are performed, none of the buffers 100 are assigned to any further second buffer. In BATES, there is no second plurality of buffers which, during the self-test, would be assigned to the buffers of the first group. See also, col. 6 of BATES, lines 27 - 29 ("If all of the test pattern signals have been issued (e.g., a

Applic. No. 10/075,656
Response Dated December 6, 2005
Responsive to Office Action of September 6, 2005

sufficient number of test cycles have been run), latch 230 may be examined to determine whether a defect was detected in I/O buffer 100 during the transmission of previous test signals, process block 445").

Accordingly, BATES discloses a loopback test that directly detects a defect in a respective tested buffer 100, but neither teaches, nor suggests, connecting the respective tested buffer 100 to a second buffer assigned thereto. The direct testing of each buffer 100 of BATES is only possible because the loopback self-test signal at the output of the driver 130 (Fig. 1 of BATES) is sent directly to the amplifier (145 of Fig. 1 of BATES, rather than to pad 135) so as to constitute a buffer-internal self-test loop. Otherwise, were each buffer 100 connected to or assigned to a second respective buffer (i.e., of a second group as claimed by Applicant) it would not be possible to assign the defect to one particular buffer. As such, it is clear that the buffers 100(1) - 100(n) of Fig. 5 of BATES, are not connected to a second group of buffers 100(1) - 100(n) (not illustrated in BATES) during the loopback self-test of the buffers 100(1) - 100(n).

Further, since each of the buffers 100 of BATES includes its own, respective test circuit 110 (as shown in Fig. 1 of BATES)

Applic. No. 10/075,656
Response Dated December 6, 2005
Responsive to Office Action of September 6, 2005

having a test pattern generator 110 and a compare unit 220, as well as a stage 215, each buffer 100 is capable of testing itself without the need to be connected to any second buffer. Accordingly, it is not correct to interpret or conclude (as done on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action) that two respective self-testing buffers 100 would be assigned to one another. If this assumption were correct in the system disclosed in BATES, it would be questionable how the second buffer 100 of BATES would process the test signals received from the, first buffer.

Actually, however, each test circuit 110 of any respective buffer 100 of BATES, can only compare those test signal duplicates (originated and received back) which are generated by the same test circuit 110 (i.e., the test circuit of the buffer 100 containing the test circuit 110). Any assumption that two respective buffers 100 of BATES, would cooperate with one another is in direct conflict with the explicit teachings of BATES, that each buffer 100 is testing itself (i.e. loopback "self-test"). As such, it can be seen that BATES fails to teach or suggest the assignment of second buffers of a second group to first buffers of a first group.

As such, BATES fails to teach or suggest, among other limitations of Applicant's claims 1 and 7: 1) that there is

Applic. No. 10/075,656

Response Dated December 6, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 6, 2005

any 1:1-correspondence between buffers of a first group and buffers of a second group; and 2) that there is an electrical connection of the interface circuits to outside for enabling a self-test. In contrast to Applicant's particularly claimed invention, BATES discloses, that the electrical connection to outside (i.e., the input/output pad 135 of Fig. 1 of BATES) is unused when performing the self-test, since BATES teaches that the self-test signals are sent from the driver 130 directly to the amplifier 145, in order to test the output driver (elements 115 to 130) and the input receiver (elements 145 and 150) of the buffer 100.

Further, for the reasons discussed thoroughly above, it can be seen that BATES additionally fails to teach or suggest, a self-test method, as in Applicant's claim 7, including, among other limitations:

receiving the test signals via the second group of interface circuits; [emphasis added by Applicant]

A review of BATES makes clear that the test signals generated by the test circuit 110 of each buffer 100 remain within the respective buffer 100.

The TAKAGI and LEVY references, cited in the Office Action in combination with BATES, against certain of Applicant's

Applic. No. 10/075,656

Response Dated December 6, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 6, 2005

dependent claims, do not cure the deficiencies of **BATES**,
discussed above.

It is accordingly believed that none of the references,
whether taken alone or in any combination, teach or suggest
the features of claims 1 and 7. Claims 1 and 7 are,
therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The
dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because
they all are ultimately dependent on claims 1 or 7.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of
claims 1 - 13 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims
to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a
telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can
be worked out. In the alternative, the entry of the amendment
is requested, as it is believed to place the application in
better condition for appeal, without requiring extension of
the field of search.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition
for extension is herewith made.

Applic. No. 10/075,656

Response Dated December 6, 2005


Responsive to Office Action of September 6, 2005

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to

Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and

Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant

Kerry P. Sisselman

Reg. No. 37,237

December 6, 2005

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.

Post Office Box 2480

Hollywood, FL 33022-2480

Tel: (954) 925-1100

Fax: (954) 925-1101